UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Ethical Religion - - -

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly *Subscription $1.50*

Except During July-August *Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

Curtis W. Reese, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

Homer A. Jack: Minister of The Unitarian Church of Evanston.

Jerome Nathanson: Chairman of the Board of Leaders of the New York Society for Ethical Culture.

George E. O'Dell: Formerly, Editor of *The Standard;* now residing in England.

Upton Sinclair: Well-known author.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 39

ARTICLES—

Ethical Religion—Jerome Nathanson 40

My Friends, the People of Japan—Upton Sinclair 44

Do Mothers Belong at Home?—Ethel S. Beer 46

Universalist-Unitarian Cooperation in Chicago—Homer A. Jack 48

"No Cross, No Crown"—George E. O'Dell 49

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 51

THE FIELD—

First "Freedom of the Press" Sunday 38

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion"

First "Freedom of the Press" Sunday

"Freedom of the Press" Sunday will be observed for the first time in the United States on November 6th, when hundreds of Unitarian and Universalist Churches mark the martyrdom of pre-Civil War editor, Elijah Parish Lovejoy, who died defending his newspaper presses in 1837. In jointly announcing this first annual Freedom Sunday, Dr. Frederick M. Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, and Dr. Brainard F. Gibbons, General Superintendent of the Universalist Church of America, invited every American church and synagogue, as well as every newspaper and radio news editor, to "cooperate in making Freedom of the Press Sunday an eloquent reminder of our dearly-won liberties and of the many political, military, and religious heroes who died to win and defend them."

Ministers in nearly 800 Universalist and Unitarian Churches in the United States and Canada will preach that Sunday on the interrelation of American freedom and religion. Members of the press in each community will be invited guests at the special worship services. "As religion always has been the core of democracy," the two Protestant leaders said, "so today it is the strongest motive force in the preservation and extension of democracy. We hope that every churchman and every editor will help us make that fact clear to all Americans on November 6th."

"Freedom of the Press" Sunday, which is being held under the auspices of the Council of Liberal Churches (Universalist-Unitarian), takes place on November 6th as the anniversary date of Lovejoy's birth. His death occurred on November 8th in Alton, Illinois, when a street mob, angered by his editorials denouncing slavery, marched on his newspaper offices, fired the building, and killed the courageous editor in his office.

Lovejoy, who was a Unitarian and one of America's early martyrs for freedom of the press, published liberal newspapers in Illinois for

(*Continued on page* 45)

UNITY

VOLUME CXLI SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1955 No. 3

EDITORIAL

The recent heart attack of President Eisenhower has suddenly changed the political climate of the United States. Recent public opinion polls indicated that should Mr. Eisenhower be a candidate in 1956 he would have a substantial lead over Mr. Stevenson. But the same polls gave Mr. Stevenson a substantial lead over Mr. Nixon. It is now evident that Mr. Eisenhower will not be a candidate in 1956. Only the most partisanly selfish and callous politicans would urge or expect Mr. Eisenhower to jeopardize his life in an active campaign for reëlection. However, everybody should hope that the President will survive his present term of office, and thus save the country from a major calamity such as would be the case if Richard Nixon were automatically to become President of the United States. The Republican leaders had staked all 1956 expectations on the candidacy of Mr. Eisenhower. Now that he is no longer a possibility, the leaders face important decisions. Will they definitely keep the Republican party in the Eisenhower tradition or will the anti-Eisenhower Republicans gain control of party councils? If the Eisenhower Republicans retain control, whom will they choose as their candidate? Mr. Nixon apparently has the inside track. But Mr. Nixon is an Eisenhower Republican only for strategical reasons and not by conviction. He would not make a strong candidate, and the Democrats would be happy to have him as their chief opponent. Chief Justice Warren would run a strong race, and if elected would be an able and a liberal President. But he wisely wants to keep the Supreme Court out of politics and, besides, his age is against him. The Republicans may well fight themselves near collapse, come up with a weak candidate, and suffer a major defeat in 1956. The Democrats are now in a favorable position. Mr. Stevenson, the most likely nominee, is well-known, greatly admired, a first-rate statesman, and a well-balanced, constructive liberal. He belongs in the Roosevelt-Truman tradition. He is right on civil liberties, race relations, and economic issues. If the Democratic party knows what is good for it, it will renominate Mr. Stevenson; and if the citizens know what is good for the country, they will overwhelmingly elect Adlai Stevenson as the next President of the United States.

Curtis W. Reese.

Ethical Religion

JEROME NATHANSON

During this period of orthodox religious revival, it is not without significance that the Ethical Culture Movement is growing at a more rapid rate than at any time in its history. Because public emphasis is most frequently placed upon religion as traditionally conceived, this is not commonly known. And because the total membership of Ethical Societies is small beside that of traditional denominations, there are those who conclude that something must be wrong with Ethical Religion.

It is therefore fitting that at this point in its history, the Ethical Culture Movement should be appraised in terms of some of its strengths and weaknesses. For certain basic questions are raised in the larger community year after year. They ought to be faced frankly: faced by those who are formally affiliated with our Movement, as well as by those who are identified with it emotionally or philosophically but are not members.

One of the most common of these questions has to do with the size of the membership itself. Continuously people ask why, after existing for more than three-quarters of a century, Ethical Culture does not have many more members. And there is the corollary surprise at the widespread ignorance of the fact that there is a Movement such as ours. Why are more people not acquainted with the fact that there are Ethical Culture Societies?

In the course of a single season in New York City, for example, where the Ethical Society regularly broadcasts its Sunday Morning Meeting, it happens many times that people will come to the Meeting House and say:

> It's a strange thing with me. I was born in New York and have lived here all my life. I have held certain religious and philosophic views which I did not think many other people shared and for which I never found formal or institutional expression. And then one Sunday morning, while listening to radio station WQXR, I happened to hear a broadcast of the Ethical Society's Sunday Morning Meeting—and there was somebody saying over the air exactly what I had been thinking for many years. It was only by accident that I learned of this Movement. Why don't you let more people know of your Society's existence?

Some of them go further and, assuming that we are not averse to letting people know we exist, conclude that we do not know how to let them know about it. They accuse us, in a word, of having good intentions but poor public relations.

Aside from this class of questions having to do with membership and its implications, the most common question concerns religion itself. This is a double-barrelled question. Out of the first barrel comes the query: "Why do you call yourselves a religion? Religion, after all, has to do with the Fatherhood of God and the following out of His commandments. All you have to do is look in the dictionary to see that religion is essentially a matter of God-belief." If to such a person it is pointed out that any good dictionary also contains a number of other definitions of religion, he will, nevertheless, stubbornly insist that whatever else may be said, the worship of God is what religion is. Therefore, it is concluded, we have no business in calling ourselves a religion.

Out of the second barrel comes a question which is even more in the nature of an accusation. Some people will ask:

> Why *do* you call yourselves a religion? You constantly emphasize your belief that ethics is really central, that the ethical aspects of experience are more important than anything else in human relations. Believing this, don't you also believe that the ethical path is one of education and not religion? As a matter of fact, don't you use the word "religion" simply as a kind of cover, in order to give yourselves a false respectability? You can't even succeed in doing that. All you do is confuse yourselves and other people.

In connection with this latter class of questions, it is almost a case of being trapped either way: for the clear implication is that we are guilty either of confusing people about what religion is, or confusing them about what we are.

Aside from these, there is a specific question which has to be faced frontally, because it has been the subject of so much misrepresentation. There are people who ask: "Isn't it true that Ethical Culture is simply a front for people of Jewish background who want to escape from the identification of being Jewish?"

These are some of the basic questions about Ethical Culture with which one who is active in the Movement is frequently confronted. It is not an exhaustive list, but it is an adequate sampling for purposes of clarification. It is in this context that one has to canvass the strengths and weaknesses of the Ethical Culture Movement at this time.

Before we do this, it will be helpful to specify in a little more detail what it is we are talking about. What is Ethical Culture? What is Ethical Religion as the Ethical Culture Movement conceives of it? A brief historical word may throw some light on this matter, and help to answer particularly the last in our series of questions.

The Ethical Culture Movement was founded in the year 1876 by Felix Adler and a group of friends and acquaintances. Adler was the son of the chief rabbi of Temple Emanu-El in New York, one of the distinguished Reform Jewish congregations in the United States. From early in his life, he showed extraordinary powers which bordered on a kind of genius. He had tremendous capabilities intellectually, ethically, and educationally. It was commonly expected that he would succeed his father in the rabbinate.

When he graduated from Columbia College and went abroad to pursue his studies in Germany, as so many young men of an intellectual bent did in the '60's, '70's, and '80's, he underwent certain experiences which changed the whole course of his life. The exploitation of women, in prostitution, and of labor were beyond anything he had found in this country, and they outraged and deepened his ethical sensibilities. His studies in religion and philosophy, including the higher criticism of the Bible and comparative religion, were responsible for his thinking his way beyond Judaism as a religion.

This latter is a point worth pausing over for a moment. There is no question that Felix Adler was still Jewish, in the sense that he was born of Jewish parents and that his earlier ancestry had also been Jewish. But in terms of his philosophic attitude, his

grasp of the cosmos and the religious attitudes which clustered around it, he could no longer identify himself with the Jewish religion, since that seemed to him too parochial, not inclusive enough of humanity as a whole. Obviously, therefore, he could not continue as a teacher of the Jewish religion, and he could give no further thought to following the career of a rabbi.

For a brief period, he went to Cornell University, only recently established and one of the more exciting ventures in non-sectarian higher education, to take a professorship in Semitic languages and literature. At the same time, with friends of a fairly well-to-do background, he established The Fellowship of the Higher Life. We ought to be mindful of the fact that it is extraordinarily difficult if not impossible to recapture the attitudes of people in the United States and elsewhere in the 1870's. From our present vantage point, the approach then taken by many well-meaning persons must often seem naive. Yet what seems unsophisticated to us could hardly have seemed so to them. The Fellowship was based on the idea that members would pledge themselves to live on a modest proportion of their incomes, devoting the rest to worthy efforts for human good in the larger community. The essential problems, as is apparent to us and as Adler himself knew, went far deeper than any such approach could possibly cope with. But it was this attitude which led to the formation of the first Society for Ethical Culture. It was from these roots that the tree grew.

Now most of the group who joined with Adler in The Fellowship of the Higher Life and this first Ethical Society were of Jewish background. This led to certain difficulties as far as the Jewish community was concerned. It was a bitter pill for them to swallow: for Adler himself had shown promise of growing into a tower of strength for Judaism, and the group associated with him were people of more than ordinary abilities. To have to reconcile themselves to the fact that people of such leadership quality were lost to the Jewish religion was bad enough; to have them establish another movement which, they feared, might draw even further strength from Judaism was only to compound the evil.

It is, of course, impossible to establish any exact correlation, between events which are general in their implications, and specific incidents or attitudes. Yet it seems not unfair to conclude that the canard that Ethical Culture is a retreat for Jews who wish to "escape" a Jewish identification is in part, at least, a consequence of this resentment by the Jewish community. At the same time, it is important to recognize that there was an ambivalent attitude in all this. Just as the Jewish community excommunicated Spinoza, while the ensuing generations have always claimed him as one of the great lights in Israel, so Jewish encyclopedias and other publications have proudly claimed Felix Adler as a Jew.

As far as the Ethical Movement is concerned, there have been persons of Jewish background in all Ethical Societies, from the time of their foundation until the present. The percentage has varied from time to time and from Society to Society. Yet it is to be doubted that, in all these years, any such person has ever joined the Ethical Movement with the desire to "escape." To do so would be foolish practically, just because of the degree to which the false allegation has so frequently been made. More important, it would be a violation of ethical conscience. For whenever one identifies with an Ethical Society, it should be for affirmative reasons, because this is the way of life in which one believes and to which one wishes to contribute what he can.

Nor is this all. From the beginning until the present time, large percentages of members of Ethical Societies have been of non-Jewish background, and this has been true in the Leadership of the Movement as well. It is ironic, if not patently ridiculous, to say that Ethical Society members of Catholic or Protestant or no religious background whatever have become part of this Movement in order to escape a Jewish identification!

We can now state succinctly the point of departure and the basic orientation of Ethical Culture. First, there is the obvious human consideration that, over the centuries, rival religious creeds and dogmas have led to antagonism, open enmity, and to bloodshed. To what end? What valid human purpose has been served?

The absurdity of such dogmatic quarrels is illustrated in the familiar story of the two ministers, of different denomintaions, who were discussing religion. When the conversation reached a particularly heated point, one of them remarked to the other: "Well, we are both trying to do good, so let us part in friendly fashion —you to serve God in your way, I in His."

This broad assumption that oneself or one's group is in possession of *the* way and *the* truth has persistently stood in the way of fruitful intergroup and interpersonal relations. It is a footless business. For no matter what the truth-claims of any individual or group, no matter how positively or absolutely one may assert his special possession of ultimate knowledge, it is objectively impossible ever to prove the truth or falsity of any proposition about the essential nature of the cosmos.

Now it is not uncommon, when this point is raised in discussion, to have someone insist that, nevertheless, some over-all sanction is required for ethical human behavior. Why should one behave ethically? How should one ground his sense of life? It is an important point; but its importance lies in what it means to us. Let us agree, whatever our sense of the cosmos may be, that some sanction for ethical conduct, relating human experience to wider reaches of the universe, is a necessity. Must it be the same sanction? Must it be demonstrated that what you believe to be a valid sanction for your behavior is the only valid sanction for anybody's and everybody's behavior?

Whatever one's theoretical answer to these questions may be, the practical answer has to be in the negative. The sanction for ethical behavior is not and cannot be the same for all people. People never have, do not now, and doubtless never will agree on metaphysical or theological matters. There are those who regret this fact and even bewail it, doing whatever they can to overcome it. There are others of us who believe that there is no good reason why there should be agreement in such things; that insofar as human beings feel the universe differently, a certain richness in experience is derived from this diversity.

With this in mind, Ethical Culture stresses that whatever individuals may believe about the nature of the universe, they ought to dedicate themselves to raising the level of human relations—reaching for something ever better and ever higher in human quality, indeed

in the creation of spirituality itself. This ethical concern, we say, ought to be the ground on which people come together, compatible as it is with a great variety of cosmic views or metaphysical positions.

In the Ethical Culture Movement, accordingly, there are individuals who believe in God, or in a divine spark, or some other expression of divine power, or in a transcendent moral law. There are members who take the position that they do not know what the inner nature of the universe may be; that is, who are agnostic —agnostic, that is, in the sense that they do not close the door now to what human beings may sometime know. There are even some who are atheistic in the sense of dogmatically denying that there is anything in the universe transcending nature as we know it or can know it. That there are few atheists in Ethical Culture should be manifest when it is considered that just such dogmatism is alien to the essential spirit of Ethical Religion.

With respect to all such over-beliefs, we take the position that what a person believes is his private affair. The Ethical Culture Movement has no "official" stand on these questions. The intensity of an individual's religious commitment is to be measured, not against any creedal yardstick, but by the degree of his devotion to whatever is good in the human enterprise.

But why call this religion? Surely, as was noted earlier, religion has to do with belief in God and with what follows from that belief. That depends. It depends in part upon how much one's interpretation of religion is derived from the Judeo-Christian tradition. In the broader areas of human experience, we know that there never has been any one religion in the world and that religions have never shared any one belief—not even a belief in the kind of belief that ought to be central to religion. Fully to be aware of this is of the utmost importance.

To be sure, from a parochial view of the Western tradition, many have been inclined to stress the centrality of a God-belief; insisting that religion has to do with God and with man's relation to God. You will not find this insistence in Hinduism, with its broad sweep of over-beliefs from theism to agnosticism. You will not find it in Confucianism, with its central emphasis upon human behavior. How many hundreds of millions, even billions, of people have found their religious homes in one of these two great religions! In them, religion is regarded not so much as a way of belief as a way of life.

We can go further. Even in Judaism, generally regarded as the fountainhead of monotheism, there has always been at least as much concern with the Torah, the way of life, as there has been with any theological question. And the fact that there are so many different denominations in Christianity should give us pause, pushing us to further reflection than is ordinarily the case. If the Christian denominations have anything in common—the Christianity, that is, of the Roman Catholic Church and of liberal Congregationalism, of Lutheranism and the Church of the Latter Day Saints, of Presbyterianism and Christian Science, of the Greek Orthodox Church and Seventh Day Adventism—if these and the many, many other various groups in Christianity have anything in common, it surely is not one belief: either about God's essential nature and his relation to man, or Christ's mission on earth, or the path to salvation. The sure way to get agreement among Christians of different denominations is not on the basis of any one article or creed or any one sacrament. It is rather in terms of the Golden Rule. That, for more Christians than we ordinarily realize, is what they really mean by their Christianity.

Insofar as Ethical Culture is concerned with a way of life, therefore, it is right to call it a religious movement. And since this concern with a way of life is, as a matter of fact, the chief concern of Ethical Culture, it is a religion.

The other barrel of this religious question has to do with the problem of ethics. If ethics is central, as we say it is, is it not a matter of education and not of religion? Again, that depends upon how we look at it. If we are looking at human relations as a matter about which we have to learn ever more, and about which we have to teach ever better, then of course this is a matter of education. Just because this is the case, the Ethical Culture Movement has always been an educational as well as a religious movement. From its inception, Ethical Culture has had a basic stake in the educational process: not only the education of children and young people, as in the Ethical Culture Schools, but education through life, as manifested in its work in the field of adult education. Obviously, that a movement is educational does not prevent it from being religious. One would not think of questioning the religious character of Roman Catholicism simply because the Church has always expended so much effort in the field of education.

In the Ethical Culture Movement, we think it desirable that the word "religion" be liberated from its narrow, more conservative, more parochial connotations and put into the service of the broadest human concerns.

Now we often hear that such an attitude is too optimistic about human nature and superficial in its appraisal of man and the universe. While one may emphasize the indispensable importance of the effort to reach out for the best in human relations, it is evident that man continues to be torn and twisted by evil. In Ethical Culture, it is alleged, there has been the expectation of an ever upward and onward movement of man, a kind of ethical evolution; but the facts of human experience point rather to cycles of civilization with ever-returning eras of barbarism. Insofar as Ethical Culture has been part of the broadly humanistic trend in religion, there has been the danger of this mistaken appraisal, this over-sanguine faith that human beings are riding the upswing of the universe.

A distinguished humanist leader of religion has described religion as "the shared quest for the values of a satisfying life." If one makes an impartial survey of the world's religions, past as well as present, one can see the sense in which this is meant and the degree to which the description is true. For religion has more often than not been thought of as an effort to control the powers in man and nature, whatever those powers might be found as being; or as enlisting the aid of the highest power, that is, of God, in the furthering of human ends, even when these are regarded as divine ends working themselves out in human beings. What else is the meaning of rituals and ceremonials, in primitive and sophisticated religion alike, but the effort to deal in "prescribed" ways with the powers shaping things? What else is the meaning of prayer except the attempt to enlist powers beyond man for the further-

ance of the ends in view? These ends are regarded as being the satisfaction of the genuine needs of humanity; and the effort in these directions is a large part of religion.

But it is not all of religion. In one sense, it is not even the most significant aspect of it. Any religious position which stops here is superficial. For the basic function of religion has been and always must be to help people live with the hardships and misfortunes and tragedies of life. That is why Felix Adler was never lured astray on this first level of religious thinking. In his stubborn efforts to find the ethical values in the human experiences of frustration and tragedy; in his insistence that human beings need not be embittered by them or resigned before them or overcome by them; in his emphasis that man can and must grow ethically and spiritually through just such experiences—this contribution by Adler and by the Ethical Movement has been one of our greatest strengths. It forwards the spiritual relations of man with his fellow-beings without resorting to that dogmatism which necessarily divides mankind.

What are some of the other strengths of the Ethical Movement? It provides a home base for those who, for one reason or another, do not find themselves at home in any of the religious traditions. Again, because there are no dogmas in Ethical Culture to stand as roadblocks to advancing knowledge, it is not only compatible with the spirit and outcomes of scientific inquiry; it is dependent upon the scientific process, in the sense that the more we really know about man and nature, the better are our chances and abilities to advance an ethical life. Equally important, because of its openness and its own spirit of search for whatever is best in human experience, Ethical Culture is able to draw upon the greatness and the nobility in all human traditions: to learn from all bibles, from all great religious teachers, from all great philosophers and poets.

What about the weaknesses of Ethical Culture? Let us be frank about it. All religions have had their weaknesses, the chief weakness in the Western tradition being the dogmatism which has divided human beings and pitted them against each other. One weakness in Ethical Culture is a certain lack of color, of an adequate aesthetic expression. To be sure, when Ethical Leaders officiate at naming ceremonies for infants or at marriages or at funeral services, there is a certain mood, a depth and breadth, which communicates itself to people in ways that go far deeper than words ever do. Apart from such occasions, however, it is not uncommon for people to say that they have great respect for everything which Ethical Culture is and represents, but they find its lack of beauty and warmth somewhat repellent. They find it too "intellectual" or too "cold."

There can be no question that this lack of an adequate aesthetic has been present from the beginning of our Movement. It is not an easy matter to overcome: for one must find and devise symbols which are not only acceptable and give expression to certain reaches of human experience, but at the same time will not do violence to one's intellectual integrity. To point to the difficulty, however, is not to overcome the lack. It will take creative participation on the part of many people, and this surely is one of the necessities confronting us in the days ahead.

But the greatest weakness of Ethical Culture has to do with all those who are with us but not of us. What about the relatively small membership after all these years? Does it mean that something is wrong with the Ethical Movement? That it means something is wrong goes without saying — and the Movement's strength and ability suffer as a consequence. But it does not necessarily follow that something is wrong with Ethical Culture.

Perhaps we can best deal with this issue by asking what it means when many people identify themselves as Episcopalian or Presbyterian or Methodist or Baptist or Jewish. Does it mean that they belong to a church or to a temple? Not at all. Indeed, many of them practically never attend religious services, with the possible exception of participation on the special holy days of their denomination. Primarily, what the identification means for so many individuals is that they wish to be married or buried according to the tenets of the denomination in question; that is, more accurately, they wish that the proper minister or rabbi should officiate at the service. This is said not by way of criticism—for such identification at the time of serious or solemn or tragic occasions in life is of major importance in human experience. It is simply to point to what the fact is for a great many Americans.

What, then, is the fact with respect to Ethical Culture? In the New York metropolitan area, for example, the eight existing Ethical Societies have an official membership of only a few thousand. That is, these are contributing members, actively affiliated with one or the other of these Societies. But if the membership of these Societies were counted in terms of the people who turn to Ethical Culture for wedding and funeral services, who attend Sunday morning meetings on one or more occasions during each season, who come to the Leaders or to members for personal counsel and help, it would be impossible to say how many thousands of people in the metropolitan area alone ought then to be identified as Ethical Culturists. Whatever the exact figure, it would surely be vastly in excess of the number who are formally or officially members of the Movement.

This weakness, important as it is, is not relevant to Ethical Culture alone. It is an unfortunte characteristic of many "liberals" or "independents" in politics and social service activities, as well as in matters of religion. These are the people who identify themselves with a given point of view, but refuse to commit themselves to it in any ongoing way.

The weakness of Ethical Culture in this respect will be overcome only as the thousands upon thousands of people who view life as our Movement does become actively identified with it. And when increasing numbers of these people stand up to be counted as members of Ethical Societies, then will come the answer to the question about greater knowledge of the Ethical Movement's existence. For the knowledge of a movement in the wider community stems from the *esprit de corps* which is generated within it, from the people who are personally identified with it and carry this identification with them in what they are and do.

Yet, when all is said and done, the full import of Ethical Culture is to be seen in the way in which it helps people to meet the basic needs in human experience. There is a profound sense in which the primary role of religion is to help men live with hope. The one

irreligious view of life is that which says everything is hopeless. The hope, the glad tidings, of the orthodox religious tradition is based on what many people regard as a kind of cosmic mythology, or what the philosopher Santayana called "the Christian epic." Is hope possible without this reliance? Of course it is—for we can see daily evidence of it in the way in which countless numbers of people go about their daily affairs. On a deeper level, however, in periods of great trouble, can a hope which is grounded ethically stand up? Can it survive the ordeals of agony and of tragedy?

From one point of view, there can be no one answer to this question; since, looked at from the inside, religion is so private a matter and is a different experience for each and every one of us. But Ethical Culture does have a group answer, as well. Out of just such stuff as human beings are, limited as we are, has arisen whatever there is of holiness in the world. None of us is saintly, but we do become part of whatever is sanctified as we participate in the humanization, the spiritualization of life. The role of Ethical Religion is to widen, to broaden, to deepen the hope that despite our limitations, perhaps even because of them and through them, the endless efforts to forward the sanctification of life are both the evidence and the vindication of human dignity.

My Friends, the People of Japan*

UPTON SINCLAIR

I have been honored with an invitation from *Yomiuri Shimbun* to set forth, for the benefit of its three million readers, my views on the coming Four-Power Conference. This I am happy to do; but I have to warn in advance that what I write will consist only of hopes and fears, for I have no "inside" information concerning that long-awaited event.

For most of my writing years I have had the pleasure of knowing that I had friends in Japan. Almost a half century ago, *The Jungle* was translated and published there, and since that time there has been a string of books—my incomplete records show thirty-seven titles—and obviously this could only happen if there were many people who wished to read what I had to say. The recent dreadful war made little difference in my feelings, for I held the military caste to blame for that war, and felt sure that if my readers were lending their help, it was because they had been taught falsehoods about my country's character and purposes. I am sure that now, ten years after the war's end, everyone realizes this; as a student of history, I believe that nowhere in its bloody pages can you find a case of a conquered foe being treated with such a combination of kindness and wisdom. It was made possible by the love of order inherent in the people of Japan.

We Americans believe in democratic institutions, and indeed make a religion of that belief. We are sure that all civilized peoples wish for peace, and that if they have the power to choose, they will not attack their neighbors. We have proved in action that by the use of modern machinery it is possible to produce far more wealth and comfort than can be got by robbing anybody else, even the richest.

We have been proving our faith in freedom and democracy by everything we have done during this twentieth century. When we helped to drive Spain out of Cuba and the Philippines, we had those lands in our grasp, and we might have held them and exploited them without limit. What we did was to set up democratic governments and help them to their feet. When we were forced by disorders to intervene in Guatemala and Santo Domingo, we stayed just long enough to see honest elections held. When we wanted to dig the Panama Canal, in the interest of all the world's trade, we did not seize the territory; we paid for the right, and we pay a high annual rental. When the Allied armies, serving democratic governments, conquered Italy, they had no idea but to set up a democratic government there; and the same was true for West Germany, though it took longer. It did not take so long for Japan, because you had an Emperor who was willing to cease being a god and become a constitutional ruler. A people is most fortunate who have a ruler so enlightened. He has won the respect of all in my country.

To my Japanese readers and friends, I say that the above record is one of which we are entitled to be proud; and it entitles us to your friendship and trust. We are not world conquerors, seizing anybody's land and looting anybody's homes; we have our own land and we have known for a long time how to cultivate it, and to make comfort in our homes with electric refrigerators and heaters, radio and television sets, and many other things. Those who call us "aggressors" and "imperialists" are spitting in the face of history; many of them are ignorant, of course, but those who teach them and incite them are deliberate liars.

When I was a small boy, my grandfather subscribed to a monthly magazine and in it I read a series of articles about the sufferings of Russian political prisoners exiled to Siberia by the Tsar. What I learned set the tone of the rest of my life; I conceived a horror of all dictatorships and despotisms, and of all efforts to deprive a man of the right to think for himself and to speak the truth as he sees it. As I grew up I became aware of many evils in my native land, and I spoke and wrote against them with all the energy I possessed. Now and then efforts were made to suppress me, but these efforts were feeble indeed, and invariably they helped to get publicity for my ideas. My career has proved the saying of Thomas Jefferson, author of our Declaration of Independence, to the effect that truth has nothing to fear from error where reason is left free to combat it. In my almost sixty years as a political and social reformer, I have seen a large part of my program brought into reality, under the "New Deal" of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. We now have in power what is called a "conservative" party, which declared that it intended to undo most of that "New Deal"; but it hasn't dared to. The American people have got used to "social security," and instead of losing they are getting more.

*Readers of UNITY will be interested in this article which was written for, and published in, *Yomiuri Shimbun* prior to the Four-Power Conference in Geneva.

The fact of importance to the Japanese people is that so far as our foreign policy is concerned, the change of administration has made no difference whatever; we are still pledged to the public discussion and peaceful settlement of world disputes, and we are helping and promoting truly democratic governments by every means in our power. "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" is a phrase that Abraham Lincoln, the "Great Emancipator," gave to us ninety-two years ago, and, as I said before, it is a part of our religion. Let the issues be freely discussed, let everyone have his say, and then let the people vote and let their mandate decide. Last year, in my country, with a Republican president running the government, the people elected a Democratic House and Senate by a small but sufficient majority. The Republicans didn't like it, but it never crossed the mind of the angriest one that anything could happen but for the Democrats to take charge and name all the chairmen of committees. As I write, there has just been an election in Britain, and the Conservatives won; the Labor people didn't like it, but you may be sure no one of them has any idea but that the Conservatives will hold power for the next five years. Nor do they believe that the new Prime Minister is a reactionary; he is a cautious man.

I set this forth, perhaps at too great length, because the problem which confronts us all today is that of Communism, an organized system of terrorism and dictatorship which calls itself "democratic," and uses the phrases of self-government to fool the oppressed peoples of the earth. When the Russian Tsardom was overthrown, thirty-eight years ago, I rejoiced, as did all liberal-minded persons; when the Bolsheviks overthrew the Socialist government and made a deal with the generals of the German Kaiser, I was saddened, but I hoped for the best, because Lenin promised that the state would "wither away." I did not then know that he had set down in writing that it would be necessary for the Bolsheviks to lie and deceive in order to get their way. He wrote that, and he did that, and his successors are doing it on a world-wide scale today. They are doing it in Japan, and my friends and readers there have to learn the difference between true democrats, who want the people to rule, and those fanatical men of violence, the Communists, who want to put all true democrats into slave-labor camps, Soviet style, and make the rest of the people into slave laborers at home.

They have done that in eleven countries of Europe now behind the Iron Curtain, and with their Red Chinese allies they have an elaborate and cold-blooded program to do it over the rest of the world. If they succeed, there will be no more free elections anywhere; there will be those hateful farces which we have seen in Russia and its slave states, of elections with only one set of candidates, and the people go to the polls and vote for that or else they go to jail. In Soviet lands the way they settle political problems is by the rulers arresting their rivals and shooting them in cellars. Nearly all the early Bolsheviks were murdered, year after year, in one "purge" after another, and all the world speculates as to which of the present group will die first.

It is with one of these "dictators" that we are going to have a "Big Four" meeting; and I am invited to guess what is going to come out of it. My dear Japanese readers and friends, I can't even tell you which one of the Red leaders will be the "Big One" when that conference is held; he may even have a bomb planted in his plane when he tries to leave home. This much I know, that whoever he is, he will come prepared to carry out Lenin's instructions—to lie and deceive. He will be asking himself, how many hydrogen bombs has America got, and what chance would he stand to paralyze us if he sent out his H-bombers on some dark night and destroyed our centers of military production? The only objection to this program is that America also has H-bombs, well-hidden, and on the following night would be able to destroy all the Red centers of military production. That is the one fact which has kept the H-bombs from falling so far: our unwillingness to do it first, and their fear to do it first.

We are going to attend a Big Four Conference and try to beg or frighten them into not doing it. We hope, or at least try to hope, they have enough troubles at home. Their food production is going badly and, also, they are anxious to prevent the rearming of West Germany; so they may be in the mood for concessions. But their pledged word means nothing—they have shown that time after time. To make a real agreement for "peaceful coexistence," they would have to break with all the teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin,, who are their gods. I am sure that anyone in that dark empire who seriously proposed this course would be shot. To bring it about would require a civil war inside Russia; and how can you start a war when the other side has all the guns—and the H-bombs? The only hopeful possibility I can see is an increase in the discontent of the slave people behind the Iron Curtain, and a revolt by the Red Army, whose generals must surely know what World War III would do.

In the face of this situation, I can only urge the free peoples of the world to stand by the principles of true freedom and democracy and let the Communists know beyond doubt that they will do this, even as we Americans are doing. In no other way can our civilization hope to survive.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 38)

many years. In the 1830's the philosophy of the *Alton Observer* was strongly anti-slavery. Its policy was to print Lovejoy's beliefs unhampered by public or official opinion. He died defending the principle of a free and independent press.

Born in Albion, Maine, in 1802, Lovejoy was graduated from Colby College. In 1826 he moved to St. Louis where he became editor of *The Times* and eventually acquired his own paper, the *St. Louis Observer*. In July, 1836, the presses of the *Observer* were wrecked by a mob, so Lovejoy moved to Alton. A new press was destroyed and thrown into the river en route. Refusing to surrender, Lovejoy purchased another press, and again the press was destroyed a year later. On November 6, 1837, still another press arrived. The next day a mob, determined to end the reign of a free press in Alton, attacked the plant defended by Lovejoy and a small group of loyal citizens. In the ensuing gun battle, Elijah Parish Lovejoy was killed.

Do Mothers Belong at Home?

ETHEL S. BEER

One evening Mrs. Gray, an attractive young mother, returned home from work. In her apartment she found her two sons, aged eight years and four, listening to the radio and waiting for her impatiently. Mrs. Gray was the secretary of an important diplomat. The position was most interesting and she liked it, although once in a while she had qualms about her children. This night the whole matter came to a head. After dinner she left the older boy with his father and took Tommy, the younger one, away to put to bed.

In the bathroom Mrs. Gray made a game of scrubbing Tommy's small body, as he laughed gaily and played with his floating toys in the tub. Suddenly he stopped and looked at his mother seriously. His voice quivered as he asked:

"Mummy, why can't you stay home as Jimmie's mother does? Daddy works, so why must you?"

His mother answered as best she could. Afterwards she thought about the situation and decided to give up her job.

In this case the mother was willing to sacrifice for her children. To be sure, she had a choice since the family could manage without her earnings. And having an easy-going nature, she quickly adjusted to the new arrangement. But to insist that all mothers should stay at home is not facing reality. Neither can it be said without reservation that the mother of leisure is more devoted than the working mother.

Many mothers have to support their family, in part or entirely. Such a group is not new. Only it has increased during recent years due to war-widows, separated couples, and the high cost of living. To be sure, some mothers take jobs to maintain certain standards that cannot be afforded on their husband's salary. But can their right to do so be questioned in a democracy? Anyhow, how good is a frustrated mother for her children? Following a career, including the professions, may seem preferable to domestic duties.

"Kate's not used to housework," bluntly explained her sister. "She's happier teaching school. Then she can afford a maid for her home and the children, too."

In all fairness to Kate, it must be added that her services were very much in demand with the shortage of teachers.

Altruism is a motive, which must be taken into account with mothers, who have spent time and energy preparing for a profession. To insist that motherhood should automatically end their careers is absurd, since the world is crying for their leadership to help straighten out the ills of mankind. Some women can carry their double-role very successfully. A busy pediatrician, I know, is an excellent wife and the mother of four. Always she manages to keep her children in the foreground—no easy feat under the circumstances. Children do not necessarily take second place just because their mothers are employed. To say that the preservation of the family depends on whether a mother works or not is illogical. Disruption in the home frequently is the cause, not the effect of her earning a living. Moreover, what else can she do when economic pressure exists?

Frail Mrs. Bendino is in her early twenties. Behind her is an unhappy childhood. However, she had a fairly good education, finishing High School and going to college for two years. Married in her teens, she now has a small daughter just below school age. When her husband was drafted Mrs. Bendino remained alone with their baby, whom she placed in a Day Nursery at three years. Then she was free to look for a job in order to save money for a business with her husband after his discharge. But he proved to be unreliable so that the plan never materialized. Now Mrs. Bendino is faced with supporting herself and her child indefinitely.

In a somewhat higher income bracket is Mrs. Owen —a competent business woman. Nevertheless, a divorce sent her back to the office desk, when her daughter was a few years old. By dint of careful planning and strenuous efforts, she sent this girl to college. With a sick mother largely dependent on her, Mrs. Owen had a hard path to tread, which is not ended as yet. Her reward—if such it may be called—is that the daughter has developed into a fine young woman, whose closeness to her mother has not destroyed her own initiative and ability to cope with life.

Of course, some mothers are concerned about leaving their children, frequently with justification.

"I know it's no good," Mrs. Vicenza, an operator in a factory, says in worried tones. Born in Italy, she still speaks English with a decidedly thick accent. "But I'm not smart enough to stretch my husband's $50-60 a week for the six of us. So I have to help."

Only the youngest of her four children is eligible for the Day Nursery. The other three—an adolescent girl and two lively boys—have to fend for themselves more or less.

"Kids are expensive these days," says pert Mrs. MacMillan, whose husband is a chef. "Shoes alone for my two big girls cost a pretty penny."

Fortunately these parents are on different shifts. So their school-age daughters are well looked after.

To state that working mothers neglect their children willfully is unfair. The majority need the cash for their families. Otherwise, would many toil year after year at tiring tasks? After all, only the minority can claim glamourous positions. And usually these are not the mothers criticized. But whether they enjoy their employment or not, it is futile to defend their rights and offer them so little assistance.

The neglect that does occur is due to the lack of facilities for the children of working mothers. When they are too young or too old for the Day Nursery, these mothers are at a loss. At present most Day Nurseries are restricted to the preschool period or less. The New York City Department of Welfare Day Care Centers—which are Day Nurseries under another name—and others accept no child under three. Few if any Day Nurseries in this country take babies under two years. Yet a long wait can cause hardship and make the mother resentful.

"I had an awful time until Tim was taken in the Day Nursery," his mother told me. Her husband was a sailor and she needed money. But Tim kept her

at home much to her disgust. She had not forgotten and still spoke of her frustration bitterly in front of her small son, who hearing her tone of voice and not understanding the circumstances may have felt she was rejecting him.

At the other end, Day Nurseries often are closed to school children, sometimes from kindergarten up. Yet these are the doorkey children so capitalized during the War. For lack of any other solution the working mother may send her child away to a boarding school, foster home, or orphanage. The problem of well babies in hospitals is well-known. Many dependent children have one and perhaps two parents, and quite a few have working mothers. Without doubt the Day Nursery could hold more families together with a larger age range. As it is, mothers hard-pressed grasp at any straw that frees them even temporarily.

Billy's mother practically rejoiced when he went to a Convalescent Home because she could take a full-time job. Billy at five was too old for the Day Nursery, where he had grown up. Kindergarten did not keep him enough hours to permit his mother to work, which she felt that she had to do to pay off family debts. The father refused to support his family adequately because he wanted the money for his own studies. When Billy returns, his mother may have to put him in a religious boarding school or stay at home again. Her other boy of ten cannot manage him. Thus the family may remain split indefinitely.

With all its faults the old-fashioned Day Nursery was the refuge of the children of working mothers from babyhood through the middle teens. At its best it centered around these children and their families, providing all-day care for babies and preschool children, as well as lunch and after-school recreation for the older girls and boys. Far be it from me to want to go back to custodial care, which was much too common in those days. But at least the Day Nursery stuck to the purpose for which it was meant—to care for the children of working mothers.

"The modern Day Nursery may have better education," a former Day Nursery girl, now in her forties, claims. "Only as I see it we had more. There was security for years for us and our mothers. The staff was untrained but full of affection. Besides they seldom changed, so that a familiar face usually greeted us, when we returned to visit after leaving."

The introduction of professional personnel has improved the Day Nursery but also has certain drawbacks. Unfortunately the cost is so prohibitive that without public funds survival is hard. If the Day Nursery could train its own workers—at a more practical and possibly a less academic level—instead of borrowing specialists from every field, presumably it could operate more cheaply. Then an appropriate pattern could be developed. As it is, the Nursery School teacher and the caseworker have tried to fit the Day Nursery into their professions by adhering to their own standards, instead of adjusting themselves to the Day Nursery frame.

The Nursery School has influenced the preschool program of the Day Nursery by bringing in newer knowledge of childhood. Only by focussing attention on this age child, the scope of the Day Nursery has been curtailed. In accordance with educational principles, too, shorter hours and longer vacations are recommended, although these are impractical for the Day Nursery. The Nursery School has emphasized the value of group experience for *all* preschool children, thus detracting from the aim of the Day Nursery. The domination of the Day Nursery by the Nursery School has confused preschool education with the care of the children of working mothers—two separate issues.

Casework has brought in other complications. Intake has been put on a selective basis. Children are admitted because of their behavior or home environment, even when the mothers do not work. Instead of considering the Day Nursery a social agency for a clearly defined group, the caseworker uses it as a tool to adjust family problems. Probably this would happen less frequently if there were more Nursery Schools available. Certainly the function of the Day Nursery does not include such exceptions. To be sure the caseworker innovated a sliding scale of fees, which permits Day Nursery families a larger range of income than in the past. While such an arrangement has its good points, charging different amounts for the same service does seem inconsistent in a world of fixed prices. On the whole the admission of a child to a Day Nursery is tough.

"Nurseries are making it harder and harder for us working mothers," a young mother, who works in a department store, exclaimed.

To answer that mothers belong at home does not solve anything. Mothers cannot be expected to accept less than they can earn, from relief. Nor are all working mothers eligible for such aid. Family allowances might help. But these do not meet with approval always, because they impose higher taxation and smack of government benevolence, which can be interpreted as interference. At least, that is a reaction in Toronto, Canada, where they exist.

Besides, why assume that working mothers are never close to their children? Certainly they compare favorably to the mother at home, who shifts the responsibility for her children to hired help, although she is rarely criticized.

"I have never seen fonder mothers than at our Day Nursery," a retired teacher, now a mother herself, insists.

Usually when mothers work, their children still are an engrossing interest and therefore do not feel deprived. The spirit is as important as the performance.

At present there are many signs of disrupted family life. The rising divorce rate is considered one. Only is this not a frank avowal of a condition allowed to smoulder formerly because of the mistaken notion that the children were spared? As for the working mother, why focus on her, especially as so often she has been forced into the labor market to adjust family finances? Whether a mother is at home or at work the important thing is to salvage family life, such as it is. Preferably mothers and fathers should stay together, if they can cooperate. Children need the guidance of both parents, if this can be achieved harmoniously. Sharing responsibility by the father and mother makes for security in the home, no matter how it is accomplished. Working mothers are not to be scorned but respected. They have an important role to play.

Universalist-Unitarian Cooperation in Chicago

HOMER A. JACK*

Carl Sandburg reminds us of Chicago:

Hog Butcher for the World,
Tool Maker, Stacker of Wheat,
Player with Railroads and the Nation's Freight Handler;
Stormy, husky, brawling,
City of the Big Shoulders:

I turn once more to those who sneer at this my city, and I give them back the sneer and say to them:
Come and show me another city with lifted head singing so proud to be alive and coarse and strong and cunning. . .

In 1836, Chicago was a coarse and strong and cunning town, but a small one, consisting of log houses and muddy streets . . . and an Indian village just west of the river. In 1836 Mr. Gale, a Universalist agent, came through the mud to solicit subscriptions for *The Universalist Union.* By April of that year, eleven subscriptions had been received. Gale wrote East, that, if a Universalist preacher could be sent to Chicago, he would be given "liberal support." And so, on June 11th, 1836, William Queel preached Universalism in Garretts Auction Rooms at Lake and Dearborn Streets.

Also in 1836, Dr. Karl Follen, a Unitarian who had been dismissed from Harvard for his anti-slavery fervor, arrived in Chicago. He found an eager nucleus of New England Unitarians who arranged for him to preach in an unfinished hotel parlor. Immediately $20,000 was subscribed to build a Unitarian edifice and the First Unitarian Society was organized on June 29th—less than three weeks after the first Universalist service. Chicago Universalists and Chicago Unitarians together played parallel roles in 1836 and in the past 118 years they have continued to help one another.

Indeed, also in 1836—a short four years after the Blackhawk Indian War—the Universalist Church in Joliet was also gathered. And, the next year, the Illinois Universalist State convention was organized. In 1841, the Unitarians built their first building, the same year that the First Universalist Society of Chicago was formally organized. History records that "there was great religious excitement in our young city . . . and considerable opposition shown to the feeble Unitarian and Universalist societies." But the spirit of John Murray and William Ellery Channing spurred the Chicago religious liberals on . . . and on.

William Ethan Manley, first regular Universalist pastor in Chicago, took six weeks to come here from Connecticut in 1843 and he came for an annual salary of $400 and another $50 for expenses. The Canal Commission gave First Universalist Church a free lot on Washington Street near Clark and in 1844 they erected a church (for $2500), called the Pepper Box Meeting House because of its oddly-shaped steeple. In June, 1842, a group of Unitarians, transplanted in Geneva from New England, established in that western suburb the First Christian Congregation. Its building, constructed in 1843—with the help of $800 from Roxbury Unitarians—is still in use today, due partly to the loving care of Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, its minister for the last twenty-seven years. Augustus Conant, the first minister in Geneva, supported himself by farming and carpentry as much as by his ministerial stipend . . . and he helped found a Universalist Society in Elgin in 1847 which became the First Universalist Society a decade or so later.

In 1852 the Western Unitarian Conference was organized in Cincinnati, and four years later the First Universalist Society outgrew its wooden structure and built a new edifice, seating one thousand persons, at Wabash and Van Buren. The Universalists in Joliet also built that year, their minister being Otis Skinner, the grandfather of Cornelia.

In the meantime, Unity Unitarian Church was formed on the north side of the river. In 1860, it called Robert Collyer to its ministry. Robert Collyer, an erstwhile Yorkshire blacksmith, came to Chicago in 1859 as minister-at-large of the First Unitarian Society. Soon he was minister of Unity Church. During the Civil War he helped with the work of the Sanitary Commission—forerunner of the Red Cross—and became the leading prophet of Union, Emancipation, and Abraham Lincoln. With Collyer in the church study was the great anvil he used as an apprentice in Northern England. In time he left Chicago to continue his great ministry in New York City.

Collyer's ministry coincided with that of William Henry Ryder at First Universalist. Mrs. Ryder and other church women established an Industrial School for Colored Girls—the first institution of its kind in the city. William Henry Ryder was a great preacher and under his leadership First Universalist—St. Paul's as it was called—had its largest growth and influence. Ryder came to Chicago at the beginning of the Civil War. He found a small city of wood and brick and left it a metropolis of stone and marble. On the Sunday after the great Chicago fire, Ryder stood in the midst of the ruins of his church, and minister and congregation renewed to each other their fidelity to their religion. A new building was built on Michigan Avenue at 17th street, costing $180,000. When Dr. Ryder died in 1888, he left many bequests for Universalist work in this area.

Again, this was a period of growth for Unitarianism. The Hinsdale church was founded in 1869. First Unitarian and Unity, within the city, formed the Chicago Unitarian Conference and, in 1868, added to their number Third Church in a hall on the near-west side and, the next year, Fourth Unitarian on the south side.

Then Universalists and Unitarians came together under the Chicago Liberal Union. They were concerned over the refusal of the Chicago YMCA, whose president was Dwight L. Moody, to allow Unitarian voice in its policies, although willing to accept Unitarian monies for its budget.

Eighteen hundred and seventy-one, the year of the fire, found both First Universalist and Unity Unitarian destroyed. Out in Oak Park, Unitarians and Universalists united to organize Unity Church and built a wooden chapel. Out at Michigan Avenue and 23rd, First Unitarian built a structure called the Church of the Messiah.

In 1882 Jenkin Lloyd Jones organized All Souls

*Minister of the Unitarian Church of Evanston, Illinois. This paper was given at the city-wide dinner of Universalists and Unitarians in the Chicago area on October 15, 1954.

Unitarian Church, out of the remnants of Fourth Unitarian and moved into a new building on Oakwood Boulevard in 1887. Jenkin Lloyd Jones came from a line of Welsh ministers. His family settled in Wisconsin and he enlisted in the Civil War, going to Meadville Theological School afterwards. He was ordained in the Liberal Christian Church of Winnetka—since deceased—and then went on to Janesville, Wisconsin, before becoming missionary secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference. He sparked all kinds of enterprises, including the World Parliament of Religion, work with Negroes, pacifism. He rode on Henry Ford's peace ship. Never in Chicago liberalism was there a leader like Jenkin Lloyd Jones!

By 1888, the Federation of Liberal Religious Societies was organized and, by 1896, the Federation consisted of three liberal Jewish temples, the Chicago Ethical Society, four Universalist churches, and seven Unitarian churches, including the new church established in Evanston in 1891 with James Vila Blake as minister. James Vila Blake came to Third Church in 1883 after the previous minister had accused the sexton of stealing his sermon barrel! After fourteen years, Blake moved on to Evanston where he was its first regular minister for the first two decades of its existence. Poet and creator of festival services and church covenants, Blake was also a prophet. Together with Jenkin Lloyd Jones and Rabbi Hirsch, Blake asked his Third Church congregation for signatures to a petition asking the governor to commute the sentences of the Haymarket Riot anarchists. One hundred persons signed, but twelve walked out of the church never to return. During the 1890 depression, Blake found a position in the public school system in order to carry out his ministry without being a financial burden to the congregation.

In the 1890's the Universalist Church of Elgin, despite a deep controversy over communion, dedicated its new building, the sanctuary built like a watch. About this same time First Unitarian, under the leadership of W. W. Fenn, moved to 57th Street and Woodlawn, while the First Universalist Church housed some of the classes of the new University of Chicago.

Shortly after the turn of the century, Unity Unitarian had to sell its magnificent stone building, but Unity Universalist in Oak Park built in 1907 the first functional church building in America designed by a young architect named Frank Lloyd Wright. In 1905 Jenkin Lloyd Jones, a relative of Wright, dedicated Abraham Lincoln Centre, the most complete institutional church in the Midwest.

In 1911 Walter McPherson went to the Universalist Church in Joliet, and in the next year Preston Bradley founded Peoples Church of Chicago which, in 1923, became affiliated with the Unitarian denomination. In 1917 First Universalist erected a building on the Midway, and the Ryder Divinity School was brought to Chicago from Lombard College in Galesburg, Illinois.

The years between the wars, however, were not good years. All Souls Church disappeared, but Abraham Lincoln Centre carried on under the leadership of Curtis W. Reese. In 1926 Meadville Theological School came to Chicago from Meadville, Pennsylvania, and Ryder Divinity School united with it in 1928. Meadville moved into its new building on the southeast corner of 57th and Woodlawn in 1932 as the great new civic cathedral was erected on the northwest corner by Morton D. Hull and Von Ogden Vogt. In 1932, Lombard College merged with Meadville. Ten years later the Beverly Unitarian Fellowship was established, growing out of Peoples Liberal Church which in turn grew out of the Stewart Avenue Universalist Church.

In 1947, Free Religious Fellowship was formed and this year it happily appropriated the historic name, All Souls Unitarian Church. The last few years have seen the rise of the Greater Chicago Unitarian Service Committee and the Ryder Community Centre of the Universalist Service Committee. The last few years have seen the beginnings of Unitarian Fellowships in Park Forest, LaGrange, and Highland Park . . . and the LeClaire Courts Universalist Fellowship. The last few years have seen the Chicago Unitarian Council broaden to include Universalists, first in the Midwest Council of Religious Liberals, now named the Chicago Area Conference of Religious Liberals. This is the metropolitan region of the Western Unitarian Conference and also of the newly established Midwest Universalist Council. And next Sunday, First Universalist lays the cornerstone of its new building, with both Third Unitarian and Evanston making no small building plans.

Chicago . . . "laughing the stormy, husky, brawling laughter of Youth, half-naked, sweating, proud to be Hog Butcher, Tool Maker, Stacker of Wheat, Player with Railroads and Freight Handler to the Nation," but also home of liberal church, home of liberal churchmen . . . Collyer, Ryder, Jones, and Blake.

"No Cross, No Crown"

GEORGE E. O'DELL

The saying, "No cross, no crown," is poetic and the title of a notable book. The Crown as an actuality and as indicative of political power is on the way to becoming archaic. The Cross, as historic, belongs in a time when, there being few prisons, many more offenses met with execution, and, for instance in the Roman Empire, crucifixion was a common penalty, long before it was inflicted on Jesus. It has become a synonym for suffering, including that of myriads of persons who have endured agonies far more protracted than those attributed to the storied Christ (whose tale is indeed a profoundly moving one), yet for whom no Stations will be found in any church, nor do any devotees develop physical marks of, say, cancer or leprosy, indicative of harrowing pity equal to that for Jesus of one or another medieval saint. The world has always been, and still is, a scene of suffering, mostly unmerited. "Still is," even in such comparatively unuttered ways as the hunger for food experienced by the countless millions in "colored" populations.

Both religion and science have tended to soften men's

hearts, so that a rapidly increasing number revolt against the notion that some post-mortem "crown" can prove the morality of the universe, by compensating for this or that "cross," at least for those holding correct religious beliefs. Ever fewer conventional churchgoers, one may hope, today feel content with the idea which, even so recently as sixty-five years ago I listened to in the divinity lectures at King's College, London, that—as it was taught that Isaiah had prophesied—the more the poor starve and suffer here and now, the greater compensation will they receive hereafter. The Principal, who urged this, did not add irreverently "Better starve, then!" As a youth living in a utopian socialist home I found the teaching shocking; I was too young and ignorant to know that it was a commonplace of medieval Christianity, very satisfying to the prosperous and the high and mighty even of a later day. In this still later time let us be thankful that humane ethical feeling—no doubt actuated by the Western world's democratic fear of Soviet Communism—is producing an ashamed call to extend practical aid to disadvantaged peoples short of food, housing, clothes, and scientific education.

It would be inappropriate here to discuss the belief in the persistence of human personality after death. It is based on "faith"; clerics and churchgoers still habitually disapprove of attempts to ground the belief in scientifically ascertained facts. Yet no one is morally justified in feeling contempt for the wish for survival—even though the forms the hope takes may vary from that of the proverbial pathetic washerwoman who looked forward to "doing nothing for ever and ever," through ascending grades to the craving for escape from human relationships into union with a Universal Soul. Perhaps little notice need be taken of those to whom the notion of endless inescapable conscious "bliss" is terrifying. But it is worth noting the curious paradox, as studied psychologically and statistically, that happy persons, especially if engaged in work of an absorbing and disinterested kind, are less likely to be concerned about their possible future than are the rest of us. Perhaps some such persons would respond gladly to the sentiment attributed to a certain Catholic woman saint and emblazoned under a great mural of her in the church of the Paulist Fathers in New York: "I will spend my heaven in doing good on earth!"

Well, so much by way of preface to the main point to be submitted here, very succinctly. "No cross, no crown" can be taken as symbolizing a cognate meaning, which should appeal to everyone, but especially to those who have no other worldly expectations, and which should be set against the mere selfish worldliness liable to deteriorate the many who have been taught that right purposes and principles have authority only if based on some traditional religious creed which they have discarded or hold only in an attenuated form. Why endure any kind of cross if it does not earn a crown? Let me argue that the cross should symbolize such sorts of suffering as are naturally incident to a normal civilized life, and that the "crown" may express recognition that such suffering may—like proverbial virtue—carry its own reward.

The word "virtue" is appropriate here. As a frequent churchgoer in these days, I have been happily surprised by the many preachers who speak less often than was the custom fifty years ago about creedal matters and more often about the ethical "conduct of life." The emphasis is not on suffering as a preparation for future happiness so much as it is psychological: setbacks, properly faced, are seen as means which elicit a man's best, create character, self-respect, and sympathy,—even a greater acceptance of life. Indeed, the preacher is likely to say that unalloyed success and joy are dangerous; he who has been always fortunate lives on the edge of a precipice; any day he may have to meet with disappointments, even failures, and not have the power to adapt himself to them. It is well that few persons are perennially lucky—frustration is a valuable factor in experience, it can bring consciousness of strength and bear in it a heartening compensation. The hedonist attitude is not enough; a true soldier in life desires courage and the will to bear wounds, if he must, even though no V.C. be waiting for him. Further, never to have suffered makes sympathy superficial; it is one of the strange paradoxes of the ethical character that we should be helpfully tender towards others while strict towards ourselves, and proud of other's achievements while humble about our own. To forego this or that, in order that another may benefit, is often far from being a loss; in the growth of inner grit or poise, though these be not looked for, it may enhance one's worth—and one's safety. To have struggled because of a good purpose, even if not wholly or at all successful, can help towards mastery of one's mind and one's fate, and herein is a crown—a crown of which most actual wearers are doubtless unaware. The cross can carry its own crown.

Subscription Appeal

The most effective subscription appeal is that made by readers to their friends.

Each reader of UNITY is **urgently** requested to secure at least **one new subscriber** within the next thirty days.

What UNITY has meant to you it will mean to many of your friends.

Use the attached form.

Subscription Order Blank

Please enter the following subscription to UNITY:

Name .....

Street and No. .....

City ..... State .....

$1.50 for one year.
$1.75 in Canada; $2.00 in foreign countries.

☐ Remittance enclosed. ☐ Send invoice.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

GAYNOR HILTON

Gaynor Hilton, daughter of Rev. and Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, died in her sleep Sunday morning, August 28, 1955. Dr. Curtis W. Reese conducted the memorial services in the Hull Chapel of the First Unitarian Church, Chicago. Internment was in the crypt of the church.

MARTIN LUTHER FILM

The Western Unitarian Conference has purchased a copy of the sixteen millimeter color and sound film, "Martin Luther." It will be available from the Conference office for use by our churches, church schools, and other church groups for a ten dollar contribution toward its cost. It is a full length movie, uncut and unedited from the original film shown in commercial houses. As a beautifully presented historical document on Martin Luther and the Reformation, it can provide the basis of very interesting discussions. Place your order for it now.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The Religious Education Committee for the Western Conference is composed of:

Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, Chicago, Chairman.
Mrs. Harry Adams, Kansas City, Missouri.
Mrs. Paul Caskey, Rockford, Illinois.
Mr. Albert Eglash, Detroit, Michigan.
Mr. James Percival, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Mrs. Vincent B. Silliman, Chicago, Illinois.

SPECIAL R.E. INSTITUTE

As a part of the 1956 Geneva Conference, the Religious Education Committee has set up a special institute for directors and superintendents of church schools. Dr. Angus MacLean, Dean of the St. Lawrence University Divinity School, author of *The New Era in Religious Education,* and the outstanding authority on liberal religious education will head up the faculty. This is the first and only such institute of its kind and it is hoped that our churches and fellowships will take advantage of it by sending their director or superintendent. In addition to the five dollar registration fee and hospitality costs, there will be a tuition charge of twenty-five dollars. Never before has so much been available for so little. Remember it is limited to church school directors and superintendents. The enrollment is also limited to a maximum of thirty. Send your registration and tuition now. Make check payable to Esther L. Heinrich, and mail to Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, 5658 Kenwood Ave., Chicago 37, Illinois.

GENEVA 1955

All registration records were broken at the 1955 Summer Assembly held on Lake Geneva. The total registration was 522. It was inspiring, instructive, and fun. Ask your friend who was there.

GENEVA 1956

Never satisfied, the Geneva Planning Council is moving on to bigger and better things. It cannot be much bigger because of the limitations in space. However, there will be more tents available next summer, since the High School group will be meeting at a different time or place and so their tents are available for adult or family use, on a first come first serve basis.

The theme for next summer's Assembly is "Toward a Dynamic Liberalism." The morning lecturer will be Dr. Ralph Fuchs, speaking on "Dynamic Democracy," and dealing with the role of liberalism in democracy, the First Amendment, and the Bill of Rights. Among the courses to be given are "The Well-Tempered Church" by Dr. Dale DeWitt, Regional Director of the Middle Atlantic States; "Being Comfortable Though Different or Can You Afford to be a Liberal" by Dr. James Bond, Professor of Psychology at Bowling Green, Ohio, and member of the staff of the Toledo State Hospital; "The Uses of Our Past" by Dr. Sidney Mead, Professor of Church History, University of Chicago; a "Worship Workshop" led by Rev. Edwin Palmer, Kalamazoo, Michigan; "The Power of the Liberal Church" by John H. Morgan, Flint, Michigan. There will be workshops for the Alliance, Fellowships, and on church music. In addition to the R. E. Institute for directors and superintendents, there will be a full religious education program for church school teachers and R. E. Committees. It is an exciting and outstanding program. Register early. Send your five dollar registration fee to Mrs. Esther L. Heinrich, 132 N. Menard, Chicago 44, Illinois.

UNITED UNITARIAN APPEAL

The Western Conference Appeal Committee is calling this year's campaign the UUA, the United Unitarian Advance. The committee is composed of the following persons and area representatives:

Mr. C. David Connolly, Rockford, Illinois.
Mr. Ernst C. Wallau, Waukesha, Wisconsin.
Co-Chairmen

Abraham Lincoln Area: E. A. Talley, St. Louis, Missouri.
Chicago Area: Bernard Heinrich, Chicago, Illinois.
Iowa-Nebraska: Dan Williams, Des Moines, Iowa.
Michigan Area: Robert Reusch, Flint, Michigan.
Minnesota Area: Ronald Walrath, St. Paul, Minn.
No. Illinois-Wisconsin:—Jordan Cavan, Rockford, Illinois.
Ohio Valley Area: Ernst F. Mercer, Lexington, Kentucky.
Rocky Mountain Area: Representative to be appointed.

INTERESTING ITEMS

Geneva, Illinois—The church voted approval of the plans and to begin construction immediately on a new wing to their church plant. The women of the church realized over two thousand dollars on their Fall Fair.

Highland Park, Illinois—The Rev. Hartley Ray resigned as the minister of the North Shore Unitarian Fellowship in July. Mr. Carl Wennerstrom, Dean of Students at Meadville Theological School, is now their stated minister.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin—Extensive renovating and redecorating has been accomplished. A twenty percent increase in attendance is reported for this year over last year.

Urbana, Illinois—A "Power Inventory" was conducted to ascertain the attitudes, abilities, skills and participation of the church members and constituency.

Louisville, Kentucky—The First Church publishes a monthly calendar, à la Phillips Brooks, with a square for each day and each church event listed in its proper square.

Duluth, Minnesota—Rev. Kenneth J. Smith exchanged pulpits with the Rev. Philip Petursson of the Unitarian Church in Winnipeg.

Hinsdale, Illinois—Dr. Sunder Joshi writes in the "Bulletin" "Attention Members: Unitarian-Hunting Season is now open. There is no limit on the number of potentials you may bring to church. And when you find a potential Unitarian, don't just invite him! Call for him and bring him!"

Indianapolis, Indiana—A Memorial Service for Dr. E. Burdette Backus, Minister Emeritus of All Souls Unitarian Church, who died in San Diego, California, in July, was held September 25th. Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, President of the Western Unitarian Conference, gave the address.

Alton, Illinois—Rev. Zoltan Nagy is now a citizen of the United States. A son of a Hungarian Unitarian bishop, Nagy was an active Unitarian minister before coming to this country under the auspices of the Unitarian Service Committee and Unitarians in Detroit. In the sermon he gave on the occasion of his becoming a citizen, there was a section entitled "The Questions I Was Asked." Here are some quotes from it.

"'What is the Constitution?' was the first question of the official from the naturalization service . . . and I answered: 'It is the fundamental law by which the country is governed.'

"What?, I thought. It is more than that! It is a faith! A faith that works that the purposes laid down in the Preamble are possible:

'We the People of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.'

"And what is the Bill of Rights? Amendments to the Constitution? I have a better word for that! It is a guarantee of the faith. What faith? Faith in man for whom the Constitution was created. What a beautiful guarantee! That the citizen is thought capable of not only accepting those rights, but also to live up to the beauty of those rights.

"An examination on citizenship is not a mere celebration of the grand ideas put down in those documents. It is the realization of some deep-going ideas on how you and I, the States, the citizens should live in freedom.

"There is an inner, compelling drive moving in you when you read the Constitution and the Bill of Rights to build the ideal society less and less with written laws and more and more with unwritten laws."

It might be a good idea if those of us who were born citizens had to be examined and do some thinking about the philosophy and principles upon which the United States was founded.

St. Louis, Missouri—Dr. Frank Glick, Director of the Unitarian Service Committee, spoke at the First Church, Eliot Chapel, and at a reception to begin the annual drive for funds for the Service Committee. Rev. John Fordon, formerly minister at Ft. Wayne, Indiana, has joined the staff of the First Unitarian Church as Associate Minister with Dr. Thaddeus Clark and minister of Eliot Chapel.

Bloomington, Indiana—A large crowd attended the opening service which was addressed by the Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, minister of All Souls Unitarian Church, Indianapolis. The church school started off with a record enrollment.

Terre Haute, Indiana—Services were held on Sunday morning for the first time with a notable increase in attendance. A church school is in the process of organization. The stated minister of the Terre Haute Fellowship is the Rev. Donald Thompson who is also the stated minister of the Evansville, Indiana, Fellowship and the Universalist Church of Hutsonville, Illinois.

Rockford, Illinois—A series of foreign films are being shown by the Rockford Unitarian Church. Special admission rates are given to language students of the High Schools and Rockford College.

Colorado Springs, Colorado — Construction is nearly completed on the new addition to the church building. It will provide greatly increased facilities for the church school and social program.

St. Paul, Minnesota—Ronald Walrath who graduated from Meadville Theological School in June began his duties as Assistant Minister on September 1, 1955. During his senior year at Meadville, Mr. Walrath was Director of Religious Education at People's Church, Chicago.

Bloomington, Illinois—An enthusiastic, gala, and heart-warming celebration and reception was given to the Rev. and Mrs. Kenneth C. Walker in recognition of the tenth anniversary of Mr. Walker's ministry in Bloomington.

Park Forest, Illinois — The Rev. John Alexis Crane, formerly minister in Vancouver, B.C., began his ministry here on August 15, 1955. During the summer the Religious Education Committee and staff spent two mornings a week preparing a complete brochure, with lesson plans and resource materials for the church school.

Detroit, Michigan — The Northwest Unitarian-Universalist Church has purchased a tract of land at the corner of Vassar on Greenfield as the site for their new church home.

Flint, Michigan—The largest attendances (except for Easter) in the history of the church were experienced the opening Sundays of this church year. An expansion program seems inevitable.

Cincinnati, Ohio—A group of fifteen members of the First Unitarian Church have "adopted" a Greek orphan through the Foster Parents Plan.

Madison, Wisconsin—Incorporated as the Channing-Murray Foundation, the student group of the Madison Unitarian Church has purchased a large residence and established a cooperative dormitory. Any contributions from interested Unitarians, particularly Wisconsin Alumni, will be great appreciated.

ALLIANCE "75"

The General Alliance celebrates its seventy-fifth anniversary this fall. For its Diamond Jubilee Project it has embarked on a campaign to raise $50,000.00 for College Centers activities. It is hoped that the Alliance will be eminently successful and go way over the top.

UPS AND DOWNS AT LINCOLN CENTRE

Lincoln Centre, headquarters for the Western Unitarian Conference, has been without elevator service since June twenty-third. The new elevator is nearly completed at a cost approaching $25,000.00. Dr. C. W. Reese, Treasurer of the Conference and Dean of the Centre, due to doctors' orders not to climb stairs, has been "grounded" on the fifth floor since September 15. Contributions to the elevator fund will be cheerfully received and joyously acknowledged.